

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Double Patenting

The concurrently filed terminal disclaimer eliminates the double patenting rejection.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,415,323 (hereinafter "McCanne") in view of U.S. Patent 6,708,187 (hereinafter "Shanumgan"). The Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit the following arguments in support of their position.

As understood by the Applicants, McCanne relates to a redirection system for handling client requests. In contrast, claim 1 of the present application requires "directing a client's request for an information object to an information object repository without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository." (underline emphasis added)

To teach the above limitation, the Examiner cites McCanne at Col. 19 Lines 35-38. These lines of McCanne describe load balancing among referral and service nodes of the redirection system. However, the system described in McCanne is a conventional redirection system, in which a request is ultimately directed to a content depository that has the requested content. Thus, the redirections are with regard as to whether the service node contains the requested information.

For example, in the paragraph above the one cited by the Examiner, at Line 27 of Col. 19, McCanne describes how, after the ARN finds the appropriate

service node (which is the node containing the requested information), the ARN redirects the client to this service node. The client then sends a request directly to the service node, for the requested information. See McAnn Col 19 Lines 27-31.

In contrast, claim 1 requires that the client's request be directed without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository. The client's request is not redirected to a service node, as described in McCanne.

The Examiner does not assert that Shanumgan teaches "directing a client's request for an information object to an information object repository without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository." Indeed, this limitation is not taught or suggested by Shanumgan. As understood by the Applicants, Shanumgan relates to remote policy enforcement in a database.

Since the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach "directing a client's request for an information object to an information object repository without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository," claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-11, which depend on allowable independent claim 1 and add further limitations are thus also allowable.

Claim 12, includes limitations similar to allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 12 is also allowable. Similarly, claims 12-21, which depend on allowable claim 12 and add further limitations are thus also allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Adam Furst at (408) 947-8200.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: November 4, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adam Furst', is written over a horizontal line.

Adam Furst

Reg. No. 51,710

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300